



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,668

12/08/2003

Lori N. Cross

CRNC.102452

4799

46169 7590 04/13/2009
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Department
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

LUBIN, VALERIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/13/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,668

Applicant(s)

CROSS ET AL.

Examiner

VALERIE LUBIN

Art Unit

3626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7,8 and 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7,8 and 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 11-21 are pending

For reference purposes, the document paper number is 20090408

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/11/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues that Wagner fails to teach or suggest a results posting module that publishes clinical laboratory results directly from a laboratory information system data store to an electronic medical records data store. Examiner respectfully disagrees and refers

Applicant to Wagner's col. 7 lines 22-29, where it is described that a data-reception sub-system receives information from an LIS. Although Wagner does not specifically disclose an electronic medical records data store, Menschik does (Fig. 7, ¶ 90). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wagner and Menschik to include an EMR receiving data from an LIS in order to facilitate data transfer among system within a hospital for instance.

4. Applicant further argues that the art fails to teach a callback module that "selectively identifies the clinical laboratory result requirement communication based on a comparison of the laboratory result and a clinical range relevant to the laboratory result, and information about the clinical laboratory order." Examiner refers Applicant back to Wagner's col. 7 lines 38-52 and col. 8 lines 23-34. Wagner discusses an event monitor which analyzes a result; based on the analysis which interprets the result, the event monitor creates an alert, i.e. identifies what needs to be communicated based on certain conditions or criteria and clinical data. Wagner's event monitor thus clearly reads over Applicant's callback module.

5. With regards to claim 12, Applicant argues that the references do not teach or suggest "determining if the communication in the laboratory is not completed, wherein a second method ..." First Examiner points out that the amended claim only requires that at least one of the limitations be met and Wagner does recite determining either if the communication of the laboratory result is successfully completed or not completed (Col. 8 lines 52-59). Second, Wagner recites selecting one or more communication channels to communicate messages (Abstract, col. 8 lines 8-22), and resending a message to a user (Col. 14 lines 38-46).

Wagner also discloses using an alternate route to resend a message (Col. 2 lines 41-42). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the teachings of Wagner to communicate message using an alternate communication channel in the event that a message fails to be communicated using a first channel in order ensure the relay of the message.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner, U.S Patent No. 6,092,102 in view of Menschik et al., U.S. Pre-Grant Pub No. 2004/0034550.

8. With respect to claim 1, Wagner discloses a system comprising a laboratory system data store (Col. 7 lines 15-24); a result posting module to post laboratory results and a callback module to identify a clinical laboratory result requiring a communication to the person placing the laboratory order based on comparison to certain conditions/criteria and clinical data (Col. 3 lines 47-56; col. 7 lines 38-52, col. 8 lines 23-34).

Wagner does not specifically recite identifying a result based on information about the clinical laboratory order, however, a predictable result of his invention would be to include as many relevant triggering events or data patterns (e.g. clinical order data) in the event monitor in order to generate more specific or custom message types (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007)).

Wagner recites a data-reception sub-system receives information from an LIS (col. 7 lines 22-29). Wagner does not disclose an electronic medical record data store and the result posting module publishing the clinical laboratory results directly from the laboratory information system data store to the electronic medical records data store. However, Menschik recites and electronic medical records (Fig. 7, ¶ 90, 94). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wagner with those of Menschik in order to facilitate medical data transfer among systems.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under the analysis of claim 1.

9. Claim 2 is rendered obvious, as Menschik recites HL7 which is a standard data exchange interface (¶ 8).

Claim 8 is rejected under the analysis of claim 2.

10. With regards to claim 11, Wagner recites a method comprising the steps of accessing a data store containing a plurality of clinical laboratory results (Col. 7 lines 15-24); selectively identifying a clinical laboratory result requiring communication based on comparison to certain conditions/criteria and clinical data (Col. 7 lines 38-52, col. 8 lines 23-34); identifying a first preferred notification method (Col. 4 lines 53-57); and automatically generating a

communication of the selected laboratory result by the first preferred method (Col. 7 lines 48-52).

Wagner does not specifically recite identifying a result based on information about the clinical laboratory order, however, a predictable result of his invention would be to include as many relevant triggering events or data patterns (e.g. clinical order data) in the event monitor in order to generate more specific or custom message types (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007)).

Wagner does not disclose an electronic medical record data store; however, Menschik recites and electronic medical records (Fig. 7, ¶¶ 90, 94). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wagner with those of Menschik in order to facilitate medical data transfer among systems.

11. For claim 12, Wagner recites determining if the communication of laboratory result is successfully completed (Col. 8 lines 52-59). Wagner also recites different communication channels (Abstract, col. 8 lines 8-22), and resending a message to a user (Col. 14 lines 38-46) and using an alternate route to resend a message (Col. 2 lines 41-42). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the teachings of Wagner to communicate message using an alternate communication channel in the event that a message fails to be communicated using a first channel in order ensure the relay of the message.

Claim 19 is rejected under the analysis of claim 12.

12. Regarding claims 13-17, Wagner recites selecting communication channels based on user preferences (Abstract). Another predictable result of Wagner would therefore be for

such preferences to include conditions (e.g. communication device availability, user availability or schedule) and communication channels (e.g. email, PDA, telephone, etc.) that optimize the message delivery.

Claims 20 and 21 are also rejected under the above analysis.

13. With respect to claim 18, Wagner recites a method comprising the steps of accessing a data store containing a plurality of clinical laboratory results (Col. 7 lines 15-24); selectively identifying a clinical laboratory result requiring communication based on comparison to certain conditions/criteria and clinical data (Col. 7 lines 38-52, col. 8 lines 23-34); identifying a first preferred notification method (Col. 4 lines 53-57).

Wagner does not specifically recite identifying a number of conditions for the preferred method, but he does disclose prior art that recites testing a set of criteria, and based on such criteria being met, performing an action such as sending a message (Col. 2 lines 64-67; col. 3 lines 1-2). Furthermore, the step of automatically generating a communication of laboratory results if the conditions are satisfied is optional, and it has been held that, "Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation" (MPEP 2106.II C). Therefore, the last limitation of claim 18 does not further limit the claim.

Wagner does not disclose an electronic medical record data store; however, Menschik recites and electronic medical records (§ 90, 94). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wagner with those of Menschik in order to facilitate medical data transfer among systems.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VALERIE LUBIN whose telephone number is (571)270-5295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher L. Gilligan can be reached on 571-272-6770. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VL

/C. Luke Gilligan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626